# Notes IDN PDP Working Group 2 Telephone Conference

*10 February 2011*

**Attendees**

Dejan Djukic, .rs
Demi Getschko, .br
Hiro Hotta, .jp (Chair)
Paulos Nyirenda, .mw
Giovanni Seppia. .eu
Siavash Shahshahani, .ir

**Staff**

Bart Boswinkel
Gabriella Schittek

## 1. Agenda Approval

- The proposed agenda was approved after the following two amendments
- (1) "Action points from the Last Call" was changed to "Action points from the Last Meeting"
- (2) "Next meeting" was added as an agenda item prior to "AOB"

## 2. Action Points from the Last Meeting

- Hiro noted that all action items had been fulfilled.

## 3. Comments Received During the Public Comment Period

- No comments were received during the public comment period. However, it was noted that some questions were raised during the presentation at the ccNSO meeting. These did, however, not touch upon the bylaw issues and didn't need to be reflected in the interim report.

- Bart is now going to prepare a formal note of the closure of the public comment period.

## 4. Next Steps Regarding the Interim Report

- Hiro explained that whilst the public had approved the Interim Report, the Working Group would now need to look into identifying best solutions of the issues raised. It would also need to look into changes of article 9 in the bylaws as well as into the ccNSO Rules and Guidelines.

- It was clarified that the group should present their preferred solutions first to the Issue Manager (Bart Boswinkel), who would compile the input from IDN PDP Working Group 2 together with the Input from IDN PDP Working Group 1, as both groups are working within the ongoing IDN PDP. This would then be presented to the Council, which would need to approve the submission. After

that, it would go to the members for voting. Finally, it would go to the ICANN Board as a formal policy amendment to the bylaws.

- It was noted that IDN PDP Working Group1 is currently stuck on the issue on variant management. It has decided to wait for ICANN staff to finish its work on preparing material for new gTLDs on this issue, as it will be similar to IDN ccTLD issues. It is possible that the IDN PDP WG 1 therefore will split up so that the Working Group can continue with its work, whilst the Variant Management part will be dealt with later.

- An alternative is to split up the two Working Groups, letting IDN PDP Working Group 1 continue its work and wait for variant management. It was noted that the number of IDN ccTLDs are increasing and they currently can't join the ccNSO. If the IDN PDP Working Group 2 work proceeds without waiting for IDN PDP Working Group 1, this process could be shortened. The Working Group should consider this option at the San Francisco meeting. However, if it decides to choose this option, the Council needs to be advised, as they will need to take a decision to spin-off the Working Group. It was suggested that a meeting with the Working Group Chairs could be set up in San Francisco to discuss this possibility.

- It was suggested that the Working Group should already start preparing a draft final report at the face-to-face meeting in San Franisco. The Working Group Chair and Bart will start preparing the final document.

**5. Changes to the "Rules and Guidelines"**

- The Working Group was reminded that the current ccNSO Rules and Guidelines were developed by a small Rules & Procedures Working Group, set up by the ccNSO Council early 2008. The Council adopted the Rules and Guidelines in June 2008. The Rules and Giudelines were aiming at giving guidance in issues such as the Council nomination process. It was underlined that they were called "guidelines" in order to express some flexibility. The procedural documents of the ccNSO go back to the beginning of the ccNSO and were adopted at the Cape Town meeting in 2004. They are posing a kind of "check and balances" between the Members and the Council, although they never needed to be evoked.
  The current Rules and Guidelines document needs to be entirely revised, however, the IDN PDP Working Group 2 should only focus on the parts concerning the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs. Especially the guidelines on the ICANN Board- and ccNSO Council election procedures need to be reviewed, as they contain descriptions on the voting mechanisms. The ccNSO Rules, however, will need a more thorough update to include IDN ccTLDs.

- Bart walked through the "Rules of the ccNSO document", which he had prepared, highlighting potential issues which need to be addressed. The definition of "members", staged voting, voting timelines, and quorum were the main issues, which need to be revisited. He also underlined that the document needs to be aligned with the changes which article 9 of the bylaws will undergo.

- It was explained that the current conference meeting was only aiming at identifying the issues, whilst the solutions would be discussed in San Francisco.

However, some discussions occurred on how to solve the definition of “members” and how the vote could be distributed. A suggested solution was to call it “territory”, or “voting units” and give them one single vote each. Each territory/voting unit would have to decide internally how to place its vote. However, it was pointed out that if the responsibility would be put on the territory/voting unit, the timeline would need to be extended, as the current 7 days would not be enough.

- Bart was tasked to draft a document, identifying issues that need to be resolved. Based on that document, the Chair and Vice Chair would prepare a document on potential solutions.

**6. Next meeting**

- It was decided to have another conference call on Thursday, 3 March 12.00 UTC. However, if the discussions on the list proof to be sufficient, the call can be cancelled. A face-to-face meeting also will also take place in San Francisco.

**7. AOB**

- No other business was raised.